

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application as amended. Claims 1-8, 10-25, and 27-31 are pending. Claims 1, 4, 6, 16, 20, and 25 have been amended. Claims 4, 6, 20, and 25 have been amended to remove minor informalities. No claims have been canceled in the current response.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 16 to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10-25, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Underwood (US 6,718,535) in view of Polizzi (US 6,643,661). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Specifically, claim 1 includes the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of:

...defining an index field map object to map one or more business components to one or more result fields associated with a search engine, the index field map object including an index field type; ... (Applicants' Independent Claim 1).

However, neither Underwood nor Polizzi discloses at least the limitations set forth above, as claimed by Applicants.

According to Underwood, Activity Framework provides the service of AFViewBOMapping, which maps a user interface entry field to a business component instance (Underwood, col. 30, ln. 44-60; col. 31, ln. 1-40; col. 37, ln.40-43). The application architecture in Underwood further includes another framework, namely, the persistence framework. Note that the persistence framework is a different framework from the Activity Framework (Underwood, col. 113, ln. 5-28). According to Underwood, the persistence framework maps an object to a database table (Underwood, col. 113, ln. 19-22). Underwood further discloses that in a relational database one or more fields can be used to construct the index (Underwood, col. 120, ln. 37-39).

In the Office Action, the Examiner contended that AFViewBOMapping is equivalent to the index field map object in claim 1 (Office Action, p. 4, first paragraph). Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Underwood merely discloses an AFViewBOMapping to map a business component instance to a *user interface entry field* (Underwood, col. 30, ln. 44-60; col. 31, ln. 1-40; col. 37, ln. 40-43). In contrast, the index field map object in claim 1 is to map one or more business components to one or more *result fields associated with a search engine*. Furthermore, the user interface entry field in Underwood is *not* associated with any search engine.

Furthermore, claim 1 sets forth the index field map object including an index field type. In contrast, AFViewBOMapping in Underwood, which the Examiner analogized to be the index field map object, does not include an index field type. The Examiner further analogized the fields used to construct the index in a relational database in Underwood to be the index field type. However, the fields used to construct the index in Underwood are in a

relational database. Underwood does not suggest or imply including the fields used to construct the index in the relational database in AFViewBOMapping, which the Examiner analogized to be the index field map object recited in claim 1.

The Examiner further argued that AFViewBOMapping in combination with the persistence framework disclosed in Underwood, which maps object to a database table, and data retrieval through the index constructed using data fields is equivalent to the index field map object including an index field type in claim 1. As noted above, the persistence framework is a different framework from Activity Framework, which includes AFViewBOMapping (Underwood, col. 113, ln. 5-28). There is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine AFViewBOMapping (which maps a user interface entry field to a business component instance) with the persistence framework because Underwood discloses that the persistence framework *isolates business components* from a direct access to relational databases (Underwood, col. 90, ln. 45-49). In other words, Underwood teaches *against* modifying the application architecture disclosed to arrive at the limitation set forth in claim 1.

Likewise, Polizzi fails to disclose at least the limitation set forth above in claim 1. Thus, a combination of Underwood and Polizzi fails to disclose every limitation recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 1 is patentable over Underwood in view of Polizzi. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 10, 16, 21, and 27 are patentable over Underwood in view of Polizzi. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

Claims 2-8, 11-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 28-31 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, 16, 21, and 27, respectively. Therefore, claims 2-8, 11-15, 17-20, 22-25, and 28-30 are patentable over Underwood in view of Polizzi for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

CONCLUSION


Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call C. Teresa Wong at (408) 720-8300, x377.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: July 26, 2005



Chui-Kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300